

**REMARKS**

The Examiner's Action mailed on February 9, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully considered.

In this Supplemental Amendment, Applicant has further amended claims 1 and 10 to recite an identifier instead of a flange, and added new claims 17 and 18 further limiting the identifier to be a flange.

Claims 1 and 10 are the independent claims, and claims 1 and 4-17 are pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by *Kawa et al.* (JP 2002-297309 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites "A notebook computer with a hidden touch pad, comprising: a main portion including a housing portion, wherein *the housing portion has an external surface, an internal surface having a receiving portion, and an identifier disposed on the external surface, the identifier surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion*; a display connected to the main portion in a rotatable manner; and a touch pad disposed onto the receiving portion; wherein the receiving portion of the internal surface prevents the touch pad from being exposed to an atmosphere outside of the housing portion" (*emphasis added*).

In *Kawa et al.*, the housing 2 comprises only an external surface, but no identifier disposed thereon surrounding the receiving portion 54. *Kawa et*

*al.* therefore fails to teach or suggest “an identifier disposed on the external surface, the identifier surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion”, as is recited in independent claim 1.

For at least this reason, claim 1 patentably defines over the cited art, and is allowable, together with claims 2 and 4 that depend therefrom.

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious solely over *Kawa et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7-9 depend from claim 1, which is allowable, and therefore claims 7-9 are also allowable.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the combination of *Kawa et al.* and *Garner* (US 6,501,462 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, *Kawa et al.* fails to teach or suggest “an identifier disposed on the external surface, the identifier surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion”.

In *Garner*, the housing has an external surface **27** with a touch pad **25** thereon, and the ridge **39** surrounds the touch pad **25**, not the external surface **27**. *Garner* therefore also fails to teach or suggest “an identifier disposed on the external surface, the identifier surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion”.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1, which is allowable, and as *Gamer* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kawa et al.* with respect to claim 1, therefore claim 3 is also allowable.

Claims 5, 6 and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the combination of *Kawa et al.* and *Keely, Jr. et al.* (US 2002/0063694 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1, which is allowable, and as *Keely, Jr. et al.* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kawa et al.* with respect to claim 1, therefore claims 5 and 6 are also allowable.

Amended claim 10 recites "A method for manufacturing a notebook computer with a hidden touch pad, comprising: *forming a housing having an external surface, an internal surface having a receiving portion, and an identifier disposed on the external surface, the identifier surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion*; and adhering a touch pad onto the receiving portion; wherein the receiving portion of the internal surface prevents the touch pad from being exposed to an atmosphere outside of the housing" (*emphasis added*).

Neither *Kawa et al.* nor *Keely, Jr. et al.*, whether taken separately or in combination, teaches or suggests a step of forming a housing having "an identifier disposed on the external surface, the identifier surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion", as recited in claim 10. *Kawa et al.* fails to teach or suggest such a feature as already explained with respect to claim 1,

supra. *Keely, Jr. et al.* is relied upon in the Office Action solely for the adhesive member disclosed in ¶[0041] thereof, and also fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

For at least this reason, claim 10 patently defines over the cited art, and is allowable. Claims 11-16 depend from claim 10, and are allowable at least because claim 10 is allowable.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should any fee be required, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

May 21, 2007  
Date



---

Alun L. Palmer – Reg. No. 47,838  
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995  
Facsimile: 202-408-0924  
Telephone: 202-371-8976

ALP/klc

AMENDMENT

10/661,587